## Prediction, estimation and attribution Exercises

Consider the following hypothetical microarray study: n = 400 subjects participate in the study, arriving one per day in alternation between Treatment and Control (day 1 Treatment, day 2 Control, day 3 Treatment, etc.). Each subject is measured on a microarray of p = 200 genes. The  $400 \times 200$  data matrix X has independent normal entries

$$X_{ij} \stackrel{\text{ind}}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_{ij}, 1)$$

1. Suppose that most of  $\mu_{ij}$  are 0, only for j = 30, 48, 57, 65, 84, 92, 113, 128, 143, 195

 $\mu_{ij} = 0.5$  *i* odd (Treatment)  $\mu_{ij} = -0.5$  *i* even (Control)

See the following Figure, where the lines correspond to genes with average gene expression of 0.5 for Treatments and -0.5 for Controls:



genes

days (subjects)

In the first random Forest analysis (RF-I), the 400 subjects were randomly divided into a training set of 320 and a test set of 80.

The second random Forest analysis (RF-II), uses the subjects from days 1 to 320 for the training set and from days 321 to 400 for the test set.

- (a) Do you expect the test error of RF-II to be lower than 50%?
- (b) Do you expect any difference in training prediction error between RF-I and RF-II ?
- (c) How many genes large Variable Importance score do you expect to find with RF-I?
- 2. Now suppose that for j = 30, 48, 57, 65, 84, 92, 113, 128, 143, 195

 $\mu_{ij} = 2$   $i = 1, 3, \dots, 317, 319$  (Treatment)  $\mu_{ij} = -2$   $i = 2, 4, \dots, 318, 320$ , (Control)







- (d) Do you expect the test prediction error of RF-II to be lower than 50%?
- (e) Do you expect the training prediction error of RF-I to be higher than the training prediction error of RF-II ?